

REMARKS

Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement on Form PTO 1449 was sent by applicant to the Patent Office on August 3, 2004, prior to the mailing of the Office Action. Applicant was informed by telephone that the IDS was timely received, but was not processed through the system in time for the Examiner to be in possession of it by the time she mailed her Office Action. Applicant requests written confirmation of the timely receipt of the IDS.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. §112

Applicant has amended claims 1-3, 15, 16, 24, 32, 38, 42 and 44 to clarify the subject matter claimed.

In claims 1, 24, and 44, it is stated that the pages “are of substantially the same size and shape.” It is understood from common linguistic usage that the pages are of substantially the same size and shape as each other. However, claims 1, 24 and 44 are amended to clarify the subject matter claimed.

The rejection of claims 2, 3, 15, and 16 is rendered moot by the amendments to claims 1 and 14 and the cancellation of claims 3 and 16.

Claims 28, 32, 38 and 42 are amended to clarify that the method claimed is further directed to identifying an organism or natural object.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3 are rejected as anticipated by Grant, U.S. Pat. No. 5,291,755. Grant discloses a jewelry charm in the form of a simulated Bible with one or more pages bearing writing. The simulated Bible is attached to a single mounting structure, by means of which it is attached to a necklace, a bracelet or an earring. Claims 1 and 2 in the present application are amended and claim 3 is canceled; applicant believes that the amendments render the rejections of claims 1-2 moot.

Claims 24, 34, and 35 are rejected as anticipated by Vogel, U.S. Patent No. 3,087,498. Vogel discloses a holder device with a tubular post means for securing perforated means of address cards, paper sheets, keys, pocket combs and the like. Claims 24 and 35 are amended; applicant believes that these amendments render the rejection of claims 24, 34, and 35 moot. Moreover, it should be noted that it is not possible for Vogel's holder device to attach the pages to the key chain loop by more than a single tubular post, as the contents of the holder device are viewed by the user by rotating the card or sheet on the single post out from between the covers so it may be viewed, and if there were more than a single post this operation would not be feasible.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4-12 and 14-23 are rejected as obvious in view of Grant. Claims 1 and 14 are amended; applicant believes that the amendments render the rejections of claims 4-12 and 14-23 moot. It should be noted that Grant does not disclose the use of more than a single connector and does not provide any motivation to use more than a single connector.

Regarding claims 12 and 14, there is no motivation in Grant to use an elastic loop, as Grant's simulated Bible is disclosed as being intended to be worn as jewelry on a necklace,

bracelet or earrings, none of which is elastic or would offer any obvious advantages by being made to be elastic.

Claim 13 is rejected as being obvious in view of Grant and further in view of Wada, U.S. Patent No. 4,642,054. The amendments are believed to render this rejection, insofar as it is based on Grant, moot. Moreover, Wada does not disclose an elastic helical structure; the structure shown in Figure 1 is merely a picture on the page depicting a telephone cord. Confirmation of this fact may be found through careful inspection of Wada's Figure 1, wherein a discontinuity in the cord is apparent at the binding of the book's two pages which would not be the case if it were an actual three-dimensional cord. Also, if the helical structure shown in Figure 1 of Wada were anything more than a picture on the page, it would be impossible to close the book.

Claims 25-33 and 36-45 are rejected by the Examiner as being obvious over Vogel in view of Grant. Claims 24, 25, 28, 32, 35, 38, 42, and 44 are amended; applicant believes that the amendments render the rejections moot.

Therefore the applicant respectfully requests that the claims with the amendments indicated by allowed and the patent be allowed to proceed to issue.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,



Geoffrey K. Cooper
Reg. No. 51, 266